THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

SAMUEL A. TANNENBAUM, *Editor*

Contributing Editors

MRS. ROBERT CARLTON MORRIS ROBERT M. SMITH WILLIAM T. HASTINGS

Advisory Board

HARDIN CRAIG

VOL. XXII JULY, 1947 No. 3

CONTENTS

PAGE

In Defense of Emilia ..... *Thomas D. Bowman* 99

Peele and His Friends as "Ghost"-Poets ..... *George B. Parks* 105

Two Shaksperian Parallels ..... *William Elton* 115

Lear's Madness in the Nineteenth Century ..... *Irving Ribner* 117

Contrast of Tempo in the Balcony Scene ..... *John W. Draper* 130

Dramatist at the Crossroads* ..... *E. J. West* 136

And Then Stratford ..... *Edna D. Romig* 142

Published quarterly, in January, April, July, and October, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc., 601 West 113th Street, New York.

Subscription rate, $2.00 per year, postpaid. Single copies, fifty cents.

Membership in the Association includes annual subscription.

All correspondence relating to the conduct of the BULLETIN should be addressed to Dr. Samuel A. Tannenbaum, 601 West 113th Street, New York, N. Y.

Other matters relating to the work of the Association should be referred to the Secretary.

Copyright, 1947, by The Shakespeare Association of America, Inc.

THE SHAKESPEARE ASSOCIATION BULLETIN

IN DEFENSE OF EMILIA

By THOMAS D. BOWMAN

FEW subsidiary Shakspere characters play as important a dramatic role as Iago's wife Emilia in *Othello*. She enables Iago to get possession of the incriminating handkerchief; she fails to explain its whereabout when opportunity presents itself; and she thereby is a powerful agent in turning Othello's doubt into conviction of guilt and in hastening her innocent mistress' death. Because of these actions or circumstances, modern theatre audiences have been morally antagonistic towards her. They have considered her more sinning than sinned against, and her final eloquent defense of Desdemona's honor and exposure of Othello's muderous folly but poor amends for her previous tragedy-breeding mischief.

However, the author's contention in this paper is that this popular conception is antithetical to Shakspere's purpose, that Emilia is meant to be a consistently sympathetic character. Interpreted rightly, she is likeable from the start and throughout: the unconscious victim of tragic error, it is true, yet unswervingly loyal in her sentiments, well-meaning and generous in her impulses, righteous in her intentions, and sensible in her moral standards. Let us analyze her actions and motives in the light of this point of view.

The most popular accusation against Emilia is that she gave Iago Desdemona's handkerchief. The only objection to this accusation is its complete untruth. Iago obtained the handkerchief by force, and against her will.[1] Upon finding it, Emilia's first intention is temporary appropriation. She will not steal it; she'll but keep it long enough to duplicate the embroidery and then return it. Anything but theft to please the whims of that wayward husband who had nagged her so often to filch the original!

But with Iago's appearance she cannot refrain from informing him that she possesses his cherished prize. Therein lies the basic tragic error of Emilia, the one that catapults her beloved mistress to disaster. Still, this is too good

an opportunity to tease. When again will she have the chance to inform her unappreciative husband that realization of his desires is at her disposal?

And yet, Emilia does not *give* the handkerchief to Iago. Loyalty still impels her to return it to Desdemona. Hence she but tauntingly dangles it before his gaze; and, with his lunge, tantalizingly withdraws it from his grasp. But then ,in possibly a half amorous skirmish, Iago extricates it from her possession and triumphantly places it in his pocket. Having obtained it, he sees no need to impart its future use.

Here Emilia is guilty of nothing more grievous than tardiness in returning mislaid property and a most excusable desire to prove she can be significant in her husband's life and intentions. And yet from such innocent impulses all later tragedy stems!

A short time later Iago, alone with Othello, implies that Cassio had received the "napkin" as a love token.[2] Othello is expeditious about putting the slander to the test. He distracts his bride by magnifying the importance of its possible loss,[3] and in great agitation demands that it be fetched and displayed.[4] Emilia is now present. She witnesses the perturbation and rage of those she loves and serves, yet she makes no attempt to assuage either. Had she revealed the whereabouts of the keepsake, the very heart would have been removed from the body of Iago's damning evidence. Her silence here is one of the most puzzling aspects of the play. Surely it reflects disloyalty, unpardonable self-interest, and craven cowardice! She allows Othello to become convinced of his wife's guilt merely to escape chastisement for a petty piece of misbehavior! Such is the general reaction.

And yet Emilia's most damaging silence again stems from innocent and decent impulses. For one thing it is here that her worldly knowledge of man's susceptibility to jealousy works to her mistress' disadvantage. Emalia reasons that Othello's fury and bullyragging must be motivated by something more profound than the loss of a sentimental trifle. She is certain in her own mind that the missing handkerchief is but a subterfuge, a convenient device on which to hang deeper grievances still unexpressed. As wife to an

unreasonably jealous husband,[5] she has learned that these husbands are given to petty indirection in their accusations. They often hide their basic marital grievances and exercise their displeasure by fastening upon a peccadillo. A modern husband can be out of his wits at his wife's extravagance, yet merely nag her because the toast is burnt at breakfast. Such silently introspective nursing of marital wounds is common to connubial experience and masculine psychology. Emilia has this knowledge, but mistakenly applies it. She reasons: this spat isn't over the handkerchief at all. It's something deeper — maybe jealousy. Why then bring the business up? It would be but needlessly disadvantageous to Iago and me, and would cure nothing.[6]

Moreover, one should bear in mind that Emilia's tragic silence here is partially motivated by loyalty to that mistress whom she had learned to love from the start. Hadn't Desdemona herself said she had not lost the handkerchief, that she could produce it then and there had she a mind to defer to Othello's unreasonable browbeating[7] Why then should Emilia produce evidence that would prove her mistress a liar, especially since she is certain the handkerchief's loss is not Othello's basic concern?

Still another damaging but most overstressed piece of evidence against Emilia's character is her advice to Desdemona in the bedroom scene.[8] Othello had promised to return forthwith. Desdemona is eager to look her best, believing it will be a mission of love. Still she is hurt by the indignities of the afternoon. With unpardonable vulgarity he had pretended she was a professional prostitute, he her customer, and Emilia her bawd.[9] Never before this frantic display of revulsion had Desdemona realized wives could be suspected, let alone deserving of the accusation. She asks Emilia whether there are wives who abuse their husbands, and vows that she would not do such a deed for the whole world. Emilia replies that diligent search would reveal a few such wives; that darkness would befit such a deed better than moonlight; and, with most clever sophistry, that the world as reward would enable the wrongdoer to turn the wrong to a right.

Such assertions do not condemn Emilia as a loose-moraled woman. She is rather sensibly though gently re-

buking her girlish charge for exaggerated trust in her own sex. Emilia realizes such all-encompassing trust in the technical purity of wifehood reflects an innocence too strongly grounded in ignorance to be completely becoming. The faith of this sheltered, artless, and now abused girl, goes beyond the endurance of this knowing woman of the world. She is old enough now to know something about the fallibility of womanhood. The shallow trust of the callow and young is always a bit galling to the worldly and experienced. The temptation to put them wise is natural.

But, one might say, Emilia herself maintains she would be eager to cuckold her husband. Can one condone that? It is true she would, but "for all the world," and most definitely not for the customary gimcracks and seducers. Here again Emilia's admission is more the gentle rebuke of innocent ignorance than callous and indelicate self-condemnation. Desdemona's vow is obviously the carelessly hyperbolical assertion of one who has never known the power of temptation. She should be given an inkling as to what her words exactly mean. She should have the wit to sense the normal weakness of human resistance if possibly confronted with such a reward. Therefore if one pauses to weigh the exact meaning of Desdemona's vow, Emilia's "in troth, I think I should" but places her in the category of normal womanhood and not with those of blunted moral sensibilities. Before she is condemned for her frank admission, let universal womanhood search its heart and find what's there.

Emilia's final speech in Act IV is a much neglected piece of evidence substantiating the strength of her loyalty. It is also a most fervent and eloquent defense of sex equality and the single standard of morality. If read aright, this speech would cause any but the most bigoted of wives to take Emilia to their hearts and forever. The gist of Emilia's heated discourse is that husbands are in large part to blame when their wives fall. She is incensed at Othello's unwarranted and foul accusations. He is obviously unreasonably suspicious; he had struck his wife before guests; he had unjustly inflicted indignities upon her beloved charge. These abuses simply can't be dismissed without eloquent diatribe. Before husbands conduct themselves thus they

should realize their wives have a revenge peculiarly at their disposal, namely, infidelity. In Desdemona's circumstances is not a wife justified in utilizing that inherent form of revenge? In Emilia's estimation she is. When a wife is unjustifiably accused, let her become deserving of the accusation. Let men know too that what is sport for them, so frequently engaged upon under the rose, is just as much sport for women. It is not the business of women to be faithless promiscuously. But it is the business of men to realize the possibility and justifiability of faithlessness when they themselves are sportively so or unwarrantably suspicious. "Then let them use us well."

Certainly such advice should not detract one whit from our admiration of Emilia. It is presented more to keep men loving and trustful than to urge women to be untrue. It is impelled by a sense of the injustice of man's domination through the ages, not by pernicious intention. It is the argument of a frank and strong woman to whom all-enduring subservience is abhorrent.

Emilia's loyal and eloquent defense of her dead mistress' honor, her forthright disclosure of her husband's villainy, and her consequent martyrdom are too well known to require comment. Suffice it to say that her last words in life:

> Moor, she was chaste; she lov'd thee, cruel Moor;
> So come my soul to bliss, as I speak true;
> So speaking as I think, alas, I die.

are Shakspere's final and strongest plea for us to judge her sympathetically. Shakspere is never given to playing ducks and drakes with his audience's emotional reactions to his characters. He never insists that we dislike a character only until it fits his purpose to have us like him. If we love his creations at the end, we should begin to love them at the start. Therefore Emilia's earlier conduct should be analyzed more in the light of her final martyrdom. And, if we judge her by her impulses rather than by the consequences of those impulses, we must place her in the gallery of Shakspere's sympathetically drawn minor char-

acters. Her weaknesses, even though catastrophic in consequence, are human and understandable enough to make her loveable.

Pennsylvania State College

State College, Pa.

---

[1]Cf. III. iii. 290-320.
[2]Cf. III. iii. 433-9.
[3]Cf. III. iv. 55-68.
[4]Cf. III. iv. 85.
[5]Cf. I. iii. 391-6.
[6]In view of Emilia's silence here, Desdemona's first comment in her defense, "Alas, she has no speech," has an almost unendurably tragic and ironic significance. Cf. II. i. 104.
[7]Cf. III. iv. 86-8.
[8]Cf. IV. iii. 60-106.
[9]Cf. IV. ii. 1-94.

PEELE AND HIS FRIENDS AS "GHOST"-POETS

By George B. Parks

PERHAPS I should have taken the title of this paper from a motto, a very well-known motto, of two Elizabethan soldier-poets, Gascoigne and Ralegh. The motto was Tam Marti quam Mercurio — both Mars and Mercury — or, more freely, With Sword and Pen. The motto was legitimate for Gascoigne and Ralegh, and it was deserved by other Elizabethan men of action. We need not be surprised if it was sometimes displayed where it was not deserved.

That is to say: the poet's crown was bestowed, during Elizabeth's reign, on no less important personages than Drake, Hawkins, Frobisher. Specifically, these three foremost naval officers were made into poets, as being the ostensible authors, along with six other equally unexpected men of action, of nine testimonial poems prefixed to a book of 1583. The book was a semi-official work of colonial propaganda (to speak in modern terms). Its sponsorship was unimpeachable, and the authorship of the poems has not hitherto been impeached. It is my somewhat thankless task to indict the sponsors for conspiracy — to allege that the book covers a series of mystifications — to deny that the gallant gentlemen were poets. I must add that they probably never claimed to be.

In exposing the mystifications, I am aware that a number of reputations come into question. Among the sponsors of the book were the secretary of state, Sir Francis Walsingham; a distinguished Catholic gentleman, Sir George Peckham; a conscientious editor, Richard Hakluyt; and two young Oxford poets, Matthew Roydon and, I believe, George Peele, who must both have had a major part in the conspiracy. Peele has not hitherto been known in this context. If we now find that he was not merely "ghost"-writer but even "ghost"-poet, we shall be discovering for him a most elusive distinction: for I cannot imagine that ghost-versifying is an extensive practice, and indeed I cannot call to mind any other examples of the kind.

The book was a pamphlet printed late in 1583 as *A True Reporte, Of the late discoueries, and possession, taken in the right of the Crowne of Englande, Of the Newfound Landes: By . . Sir Humfrey Gilbert Knight.* The preliminary poems vary in number in different copies of the book, as I learn from Professor Fredson T. Bowers, the largest number being ten, as in the Huntington copy. The names subscribed to the poems are those of Sir William Pelham, general recently commanding in Ireland; Sir Francis Drake, recently knighted after his circumnavigation; John Hawkins; and John Achelley, merchant of London. The ham, Captain Martin Frobisher, and Captain John Chester, ship-captains in the Elizabethan sense, that is commanders rather than navigators. And there were three merchants: Anthony Parkhurst of Bristol, a backer of Gilbert; Arthur Hawkins; and John Achelley, merchant of London. The first three of these nine persons were probably interested in the Gilbert enterprise in only a general way, and were used as a "front"; the others were, probably or certainly, interested as "adventurers" (subscribers) or as "enterprisers" (participants). One more author is set down among these nine men of action: Matthew Roydon, newly M. A. of Oxford and a known poet, who addresses rather the author of the book than, like the others, the enterprise itself.

Now some of these men of action might have written verse. Drake and Hawkins, for example, were not mere salty sea-dogs, and Hawkins especially, as chief administrative officer of the navy, was quite able to express himself, at least in prose. Of the merchants, Parkhurst had written a highly literate description of Newfoundland which Hakluyt was later to print.[2] On the other hand, we know that Martin Frobisher had difficulties with the pen, and as we lengthen the list of our ostensible poets to the full nine, we increase our doubts of their talent. One or two might have written verse to be smoothed out by a professional writer, but not nine, we suppose.

The doubts become imperative when we look at the poems themselves. One echoes another in idea, as perhaps we should expect, sounding the call to fame, to wealth, and to patriotism. One echoes another, moreover, in their smooth fluency. And, most striking indication of a skilled

rather than an untutored hand, one echoes another in the neat packaging of the idea, which is normally developed in a 1-2-3-and-summary fashion. These were professional poets, in sum: or rather, these were *a* professional poet.

Examples will speak louder than my words.

Sir Fraunces Drake Knight in commendation of this Treatise.

Who seekes, by worthie deedes, to gaine renowme for hire:
Whose hart, whose hand, whose purse is prest: to purchase his desire[:]
If any such there bee, that thristeth after Fame:
Lo, heere a mean, to winne himselfe an euerlasting name.
Who seekes, by gaines and wealth, t'aduance his house and blood:
Whose care is great, whose toile no lesse, whose hope, is all for good
If anie one there bee, that couettes such a trade:
Lo, heere the plot for common wea[l]th, and priuate gaine is made.
Hee, that for vertues sake, will venture farre and neere:
Whose zeale is strong, whose practize trueth, whose faith is void of feere,
If anie such there bee, inflamed with holie care.
Heere may hee finde, a readie meane, his purpose to declare:
So that, for each degree, this Treatise dooth vnfolde:
The path to Fame, the proofe of zeale, and way to purchase golde.

Fraunces Drake.

M. John Hawkins, his opinion of this intended Voyage.

If zeale to God, or countries care, with priuate gaines accesse,
Might serue for spurs vnto th'attempt this pamflet doth expresse.
One coast, one course, one toile might serue, at ful to make declard
A zeale to God, with countries good, and priuate gaines regarde.

And so on, with apt allusions, by way of distinction from the preceding poem, to the colonial history of Rome and of Troy, clearly got up for the occasion.

The Bristol merchant, Anthony Parkhurst, rings the same changes.

Beholde a worke that dooth reueale,
The ready way to welth and fame.
Commodious to the common weale.
And just without impeache of blame.

Ironically enough, it is the heavy-handed Frobisher who here blossoms into the soul of wit, compressing into

the briefest space the ideas developed at greater length in the other poems:

> Maister Captaine Frobisher, in commendation of the voyage.
> A Pleasaunt ayre, a sweet and firtell soile,
> A certaine gaine, a neuer dying praise:
> An easie passage, voide of lothsome toile,
> Found out by some, and knowen to mee the waies.
> All this is there, then who will refraine to trie:
> That loues to liue abroade, or dreades to die.

I add the one authentic poem in order to show a different quality of style, I think, a less smooth air and a more subtle.

> Mathew Roydon Maister of Arte to his fellowe Student.
> To praise thy booke because I am thy freende,
> Though it be common, and thy due indeede:
> Perhaps it may some daintie eare offende,
> Reproofe repines that vertue hath her meede.
> Yet neuerthelesse how euer thinges succeede,
> Sith to no other ende thy booke was made:
> All that I wish, is that thou mayest perswade.

We know that Roydon could write verse, for he had already published, with Peele and others, a testimonial poem in Thomas Watson's *Passionate Century of Love* of the year before, Watson being also an Oxford poet; and Roydon was later to publish an elegy for Sidney with Spenser's "Astrophel". But the other supposed poets, the nine smoothly professional writers? The mystification begins to be amazing. Surely no editor could expect a reader to believe in this array of famous men as poets. Surely no reader could fail to see the audacity of these lying testimonials. The mystification sounds almost juvenile, especially if, as we must suppose, the soldiers and merchants permitted the use of their names.

But before we can guess the real author of these poems, we shall have to uncover more mystery. We shall have to ask who wrote the book, and why.

2

The pamphlet is the first and only separately published account of Sir Humfrey Gilbert's disastrous voyage to

North America in 1583. Though called *A True Reporte,* it is not really a report of the voyage at all, except as the events are briefly summarized in the first few pages. It is instead an argument and a prospectus for carrying on Gilbert's colonial project, despite Gilbert's own failure to find a colonial site, to bring back the men and materials for settlement, which were shipwrecked, or even to bring himself back, for he was still unreported when the pamphlet was finished some seven weeks after the return of the one surviving vessel. Gilbert was never heard from; but his backers were attempting in this prospectus to gloss over the failure, and to invite support for a following enterprise. They may have succeeded. At least Ralegh, Gilbert's half-brother, carried on, and did establish a colony in Virginia.

A True Reporte was neither a report, nor true: at least it was not true to the ominous facts of Gilbert's failure. Furthermore, it threw a thick veil of mystery over its author or authors, not only in the poems which were so brazenly "ghost"-written for it, but also in the authorship of the book itself.

There ought not to be any question of the authorship. In 1589 Hakluyt reprinted the *Reporte,* with another complete and authentic unpublished account of the voyage, in the first edition of his *Principall Navigations,*[3] first shearing away as usual the dedication and the testimonial verses which provided the mystery, and also omitting the last pages which announced the cost of shares in the now defunct colony. In reprinting merely the body of the book, Hakluyt categorically labeled it as "Written by Sir George Pecham Knight, the chiefe aduenturer, and furtherer of Sir Humfrey Gilbertes voyage to Newfound land." This ascription was repeated in Hakluyt's 1600 edition, and was naturally accepted by Purchas. It has not, I think, been challenged.

I wish now to argue that Peckham was probably only part author of the text which Hakluyt reprinted; that he did not write the original dedication, which is signed with his initials G. P.; and that Peele and his friends were concerned in both the text and the dedication as well as in the verses.

The pamphlet was published anonymously, the authorship being revealed in the dedication to Sir Francis Walsingham, secretary of state, by "Your Honours poore Scholler. . G. P.", which is dated "From my lodging in Oxforde, the tweluth of Nouember". G. P. cannot be Sir George Peckham, as we have always assumed. In 1583 he was nearing fifty, he was a knight, he had entertained the Queen at his estate in Buckinghamshire, he had been high sheriff of the county.[4] He was not only an important land-owner, but he must have had considerable wealth if he was the "chiefe aduenturer" or investor in Gilbert's enterprise. He could not have been a "poore Scholler".

It is true that Peckham was a Catholic and a recusant, and it is now understood that in obtaining from Gilbert by sub-patent an enormous tract of North America, he was arranging, with Walsingham's connivance, a means of escape for English Catholics to America.[5] He and Walsingham might therefore have wished to conceal from the public, and from the disapproving Catholic powers abroad as well, his and his fellow-Catholics' interest in an oversea refuge.

Sir George had other reasons for taking on a mask. As the principal furtherer of the first expedition, which had so signally failed, he was not the most convincing person to argue the success of the next expedition. And again, it was not then the custom for the gentry to advertise their connection with money-making, or at least investing, schemes. For all or any of these reasons, Peckham must have sought an outsider to father his prospectus.

Or is it possible that he actually wrote himself down, with tongue in cheek, a "poore Scholler"? at the same time assuming in his dedication the apologetic style of a young and obscure man, and in the text the pedantic style of a student? We must ask the question, though the answer seems obvious. As joke perhaps, it might please the knight to disguise himself as a young man in a lodging at Oxford, for he himself had had such a lodging as recently as ten years before. To be sure, his lodging was the principal's rooms in Gloucester Hall, and hardly suitable for a poor scholar. Perhaps it was a joke, which was carried through in the embarrassed beginning of the dedication:

> How much more happie might I account my selfe . . if I had so well applied my time in this Vniuersitie, as through my more dilligent studye, I were able to handle the matter . . .

But the joke cannot be carried through the text of the *Reporte,* with its evident inside knowledge of the enterprise. Nor can it easily stand the shock of discovering that one respectable member of the university, Matthew Roydon, M. A., who must have been in the secret, also contributed to the deception by writing his testimonial poem to "his fellowe Student" about "thy booke," calling himself "thy freende." Roydon took his M. A. in 1580, and was presumably still a young man; Sir George's student days were long past, dating back before 1554 when he married. Peckham could not have been Roydon's fellow-student, even in jest. Peckham could not have been G. P., and he could not have written the dedication.

If Peckham did not write the dedication, did he write the text of the *Reporte*? G. P. claimed it in his dedication, and Roydon backed him up in his poem. Hakluyt, on the other hand, whom we cannot lightly discredit, claimed it for Peckham. Can we perhaps reconcile these claims? By walking a rather narrow knife-edge, we might steer a course between them. In engaging G. P. to write the dedication and appear as ostensible author, Peckham may also have turned over his manuscript to G. P. to copy and to amplify. In so far as he may have revised and amplified, G. P. might then, in the natural pride of youth, have persuaded himself that he had written the book himself in developing the older man's incompetent sketch (as he could have thought it). Certainly Roydon could not have believed that his friend wrote the book unless there had been some contribution from G. P., and enough of a contribution for both G. P. and Roydon to believe in G. P.'s authorship. In sum, unless outright lying was going on, I conclude that Peckham and G. P. were the co-authors of the text.

Such a conclusion is supported by the strong suggestion of two hands engaged in the writing. One writer was official and authoritative on the facts, having an inside knowledge of the Gilbert arrangements: this could not have been the

poore scholler. The other writer was pedantically inclined, or shall we say merely academic? running through his biblical and patristic histories to support, beyond all need, the argument that colonies were legitimate; running also through recent travel-books to find a serried list of precedents for colonizing. As the matter of the two writers varies, so does the style. Sometimes it is somewhat fumbling and undirected; sometimes it is serried and academic. Now it is possible that Peckham still retained the academic habits of documentation and of a scholastic Latinity of style; but since we are obliged to find two authors, we may distinguish them by assigning to G. P. the academic matter and form. I have, for my own amusement, divided the book between the two authors, assigning somewhat less than one-third to G. P.: but I set up no strong claims for my judgment. I need only demonstrate the possibility of distinguishing two authors. I do not need to demonstrate the fact of joint authorship, which is proved by the testimony of Roydon and G. P., on the one hand, and of Hakluyt on the other.

In reprinting the text, Hakluyt made no change in it except to omit the investment details at the end. So he saved the appearances. But knowing Hakluyt, I guess that he hoped that the wretched little book, with its faked authorship and its ghost-written poems, would be forgotten, and not rise up to haunt his editorial conscience.

For he himself was in a way responsible for the original faking. He was responsible because he was not on hand himself to take charge of the pamphlet. This surprising inference comes from asking a further question, why on earth did Peckham go to Oxford to find an author for a pamphlet to be published in London for the benefit of the city and the court? I can see but one answer, and that is that Hakluyt was in Oxford, and had already published two books relative to American colonizing. He was already an authority, and he had worked with Peckham in the venture. If Peckham went to Oxford for his author, he must have been looking for Hakluyt. I add that Peckham's home was at Denham in Bucks, in the next county to Oxford.

But Hakluyt was not in Oxford in the fall of 1583. He had left England for a post in the Paris embassy on Sep-

tember 28, six days after the return of the one surviving vessel of Gilbert's fleet. Instead of Hakluyt, Peckham must have collected G. P. and probably Roydon to work on his book, which was finished, except perhaps for some of the poems, by November 12. Who was G. P.?

3

I do not know. He may most simply have been Sir George's son George, who matriculated at Exeter College in 1575 when he was 14, and who, being now of age, shared with his father in an American land grant from Gilbert. Young George had at least the beginning of a university education, he had an interest in the American venture, and he was young enough to qualify as Roydon's fellow-student —if he was a student. We know no more about him, and cannot say whether he was still at Oxford and had a lodging there, whether he could write, whether he was well read or could be well coached in the church historians and the historians of travel who are quoted in the book, whether he was a friend to Roydon. If *he* was G. P., it is simple enough to suppose that Sir George turned the book over to him, and that he got Roydon to write or procure the poems. But we know nothing more about young George than that he was his father's son.

To look for other G. P.'s is not to hunt for needles in haystacks. We know nothing about a George Portington, or a Geoffrey Percivale; George Pettie had left long since; and George Puttenham is not recorded at Oxford. We are left with George Peele.

Peele was in residence at Oxford from 1572 to 1581, and was a student of Christchurch, as was Hakluyt. Hakluyt was in residence from 1570 to 1583. Roydon took his M. A. in 1580, the only fact known of his university life. For Peele, he was back in Oxford in 1583: in March to appear in the university court, and in June to help his friend William Gager, also of Christchurch and also a friend of Hakluyt's, in productions of his plays. He may have been there also in October, and available for Peckham's purpose.

I admit that we do not know of Peele's writing anything else like the *Reporte*. Nor do we know of any link between him and Peckham, except by way of Hakluyt—

but this exceptpion is enough. Otherwise Peele qualifies as a fellow-student of Roydon's, a poor scholar, and a poet. To be sure, we do not need to find a poet to be G. P., writing a prose dedication and revising a prose text. But having found a G. P. who was friend of Roydon, we certainly find it convenient to have him a poet too, competent to write the nine testimonial poems. To be sure, Roydon might have written them, though they do not sound much like him; or perhaps Thomas Watson; or X. But Peele, being available as G. P., is the most likely candidate for the authorship of the poems as well as the prose.

If we look at Peele's first extant poems, the earlier *Tale of Troy,* his poem in Watson's *Passionate Century,* his forthcoming first play, *The Arraignment of Paris,* we find that they were written in an effortless but not distinguished verse, like the poems in *A Reporte.* It is true that Peele's extant verse is usually pentameter, while these poems vary between pentameter and "fourteener"; but so does *The Arraignment,* thus showing that Peele was still free in 1584 to write in the sixes and sevens of the period before Marlowe and Spenser. In the *Reporte* poems, the style is not unlike the early Peele's, simple and even a little awkward, showing no sign of the later florid style of the revised *Tale of Troy,* or the lyric strain or the Marlowe line in his later plays. He could have written the *Reporte* poems; he was there to do them; he propably did them.

I do not know how much this little detective story proves. We need no ghost come from the grave to tell us that persons who sign testimonials do not necessarily write them. We are used to many kinds of disguised authorship, usually of the sort which the Elizabethans and Horace likened to Aesop's crow strutting in peacock feathers. We have heard of the lesser writer claiming the works of greater men, like Bathyllus pretending to be Virgil, and Ireland pretending to be Shakspere. We know of subordinates writing reports for generals and statesmen to sign. These activities we call ghost-writing. But we do not expect the like ghost-writing of verse, and certainly we do not expect the poet to pretend to be a soldier. This is not a case of the crow and the peacock, but of the peacock pretending to be an eagle. Perhaps there may be more cases of the sort than we are ready to admit—or to welcome when we find them.

Queens College, Flushing, N. Y.

TWO SHAKSPERIAN PARALLELS

By William Elton

IN support of Professor W. T. Hastings' cogent remarks on the conventional ancestry of Shakspere's Autolycus,[1] an apparently unnoted parallel may be cited from John Heywood's *The Four P. P.* (*c.* 1520-22).[2] In this play, the Pedlar, joining the 'Pothecary, the Palmer, and the Pardoner, "pushes" his wares with a flair reminiscent of Autolycus; his womanish goods are similar; his "pitch" is equally addressed to lovers; his cry, "come, buy me," is identical; he is likewise a singing man; and, indeed, he furnishes the occasion for a lengthy anticipation of Autolycus' coarse pin joke (*W. T.*, IV, iv, 223-4). His "spiel" may be compared to Autolycus' (*W. T.*, IV, iv, 215-27, 309-317):

> Gloves, pins, combs, glasses unspotted,
> Pomades, books, and laces unknotted;
> Broaches, rings, and all manner of beads;
> Laces, round and flat, for women's heads;
> Needles, thread, thimble, shears, and all such knacks,
> Where lovers be, no such thing lacks:
> Sipers, swathbands, ribbons, and sleeve laces,
> Girdles, knives, purses, pincases.[3]

II

A dramatic anticipation of Menenius' fable of the belly and the members (*Coriolanus*, I, i, 95-159), which seems to have escaped specific mention, occurs in the medieval *moralité joyeuse* of *Le Ventre, Les Jambes, Le Coeur, et Le Chef*. As in Shakspere, the stomach asserts, in reply to the other members' complaints that it receives all the food, that it furnishes the sustenance for their existence:

> C'est moy qui donne aux membres vye,
> Et sans moy tout membre desuye,
> Sans moy plaisir ne prend le coeur.
> Chef, bras, iambes mes en vigueur,
> Quant ie fuys remply & noury;[4]

Brown University, Providence, R. I.

[1]*SAB,* XV (1940), 253. Cf. J. R. Moore, "Ancestors of Autolycus in the English Moralities and Interludes," *Washington University Studies,* Humanistic ser., IX (1922), 157-64. The Furness Variorum *Winter's Tale* (p. 214) cites Heywood in passing, but in another connection.

[2]Ed. J. S. Farmer, *The Dramatic Writings of John Heywood* (London, 1905), pp. 35-8.

[3]*Ibid.,* p. 36.

[4]Ed. Leroux de Lincy and Francisque Michel, *Recueil de Farces, Moralités, et Sermons Joyeux.* 4 vols. (Paris, 1837), II (no. 9), 5.

LEAR'S MADNESS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY

By Irving Ribner

THE Shakspere character critics of the eighteenth century, venturing uncertainly into an aspect of literary art which was in its earliest infancy, had begun to speculate about the nature of Lear's madness, its causes, manifestations and effects upon the dramatic machinery of the tragedy. These early critics developed basic attitudes of interpretation which are of great importance in the history of Shakspere criticism. They were the starting points from which the critics of the nineteenth century, writing with the help of growing bodies of psychiatric science as well as literary theory, created a body of literary-scientific interpretation of Lear which this study proposes to examine.

Such examination may have a two-fold value. In the first place, the body of criticism is of intrinsic value as a peculiar manifestation in the history of Shaksperian interpretation. Although many of the scientific theories and critical attitudes upon which it was based have been discarded by our own century, its value is not nullified. For literary criticism is a subjective art whose life is no more dependent upon the validity of the beliefs of the era which produced it than is that of any other art form. No amount of modern scholarly lore can destroy the worth of the studies of Samuel Taylor Coleridge. As representatives of an independent art form, they are as eternal as Shakspere's plays themselves.

In the second place, through the focal point of Lear's madness we can get an insight into the general thought patterns of the nineteenth century, their relationship to those of the eighteenth, and in what ways they have been accepted, discarded and modified by our own age. One of the basic ends of all literary study is insight into the inter-relationship of the thought patterns of the various ages, and there is no better way by which we may arrive at such insight than by seeing them all in independent reaction to a common problem.

The eighteenth century had produced two significant interpretations of Lear's madness. The first of these was that of Joseph Warton who, in what Herbert S. Robinson calls "the first connected series of papers in an eighteenth century periodical to deal with the criticism of Shakespeare,"[1] treated the subject in Essays 113, 116 and 122 of *The Adventures,* the last three essays of a series which ran from Sept. 25, 1753 to Jan. 5, 1754.[2] Lear's madness, said Warton, is a real mental aberration which occurs during the scene on the heath and as a result of the cruelty he has suffered at the hands of his daughters.[3] He then pointed to one of its cardinal symptoms:

> Madness being occasioned by a close and continued attention of the mind to a single object, Shakespeare judiciously represents the resignation of his crown to daughters so cruel and unnatural as the particular idea which has brought on the distraction of Lear, and which perpetually recurs to his imagination, and mixes itself with all his ramblings.[4]

This is the earliest known instance of the delineation of Lear's monomaniacal fixation upon the cruelty of his daughters as a symptom of his madness, and it was an observation which was to be echoed and re-echoed by later critics. Henry Mackenzie in Essay 100 of *The Mirror,* published on Saturday, April 22, 1780, in attempting to draw the distinction between real and pretended madness as illustrated by Lear on the one hand and by Edgar on the other, repeated it.[5] And again in the eighteenth century it was reiterated by Horace Walpole in the postscript to his *Mysterious Mother.*[6]

The other great contribution of the eighteenth century to the study of Lear's madness was that of Charlotte Lennox, daughter of Colonel James Ramsay, Lieut. Governor of New York.[7] Mrs. Lennox maintained that Lear was a madman from the very first scene of the play to the last. The story for her was not of a man who loses his mind through his misfortunes, but rather of the antics of an irresponsible madman.[8] The play thus became a composition lacking in tragic *nexus* and therefore one of little merit.

In addition to these two principal ideas, we should give some further emphasis to Henry Mackenzie's distinction

between Lear's real and Edgar's pretended madness.[9] That also was a distinction which the following century was to echo, modify and develop. In fact, the very first critic of the nineteenth century, Charles Dibdin, repeated it almost verbatim.[10] Bud Dibdin is essentially insignificant. It is with Coleridge that nineteenth-century analysis of Lear actually begins.

Coleridge dismissed the notion of Lear's madness from the play's beginning. Lear is not mad and there is nothing in his actions which is difficult to believe. He is merely an old man enjoying a childish game, and when his game misfires, he flies into a rage.[11] Madness is the natural result of extreme suffering; in Lear's case its first symptoms appear in Act III, scene iv. and in the last scene of the play his reason returns.[12] His madness is only one of the temporary manifestations of his suffering.

Coleridge set the pattern for the interpretation of Lear in the first half of the nineteenth century. Charles Lamb did not differ from him in his analysis of the nature and development of the madness, but he added to it an interesting observation upon its dramatic function. Lamb's dominant impression of *King Lear* was that of a play of unutterable tragic grandeur — a grandeur so overwhelming that the play could never be adequately staged. This grandeur, he said, was brought to the surface by Shakspere's skillful use of the dramatic potentialities of madness.[13] Lamb was followed closely by Hazlitt who also pointed out Shakspere's ability to use madness for dramatic purposes and who also emphasized the distinction between real and pretended madness:

> Lear's real and Edgar's assumed madness, while the resemblance in the cause of their distresses, from the severing of the nearest ties of natural affection, keeps up a unity of interest. Shakespear's mastery over his subject, if it is not art, was owing to a knowledge of the connecting links of the passions and their effect upon the mind.[14]

In 1841, Henry Hallam reaffirmed the romantic notion of the intellectual grandeur that is inherent in madness while he pointed out the eloquence that may belong to suffering:

> Then comes on that splendid madness, not absurdly sudden, as in some tragedies, but in which the strings that keep his reasoning power together give way, one after the other, in the frenzy of rage and grief. Then it is that we find what in life may sometimes be seen, the intellectual energies grow stronger in calamity and especially under wrong. An awful eloquence belongs to unmerited suffering. Thoughts burst out, more profound than Lear in his prosperous hour could ever have conceived; inconsequent—for such is the condition of madness—but in themselves fragments of coherent truth, the reason of an unreasonable mind.[15]

The comments of Coleridge, Lamb, Hazlitt and Hallam may be considered as parts of the same movement: that of the consideration of Lear's madness by leaders of the Romantic movement according to the canons of Romantic literary theory. The second quarter of the nineteenth century produced another class of commentators which is almost unique in the history of literary criticism. A group of professional psychiatrists studied Lear's mental disease and attempted to analyze it in the light of the psychiatric knowledge of the day. The first of these scientific interpretations appeared in 1844.

In July of that year, Dr. A. Brigham, in an essay called "Shakespeare's Illustrations of Insanity," which appeared in *The American Journal of Insanity,* declared that Lear was "a genuine case of insanity from the beginning to the end."[16] Dr. Brigham went much farther than Charlotte Lennox who a century earlier had stated this case for the first time. To Brigham, Lear's initial madness was so evident at the very beginning of the play, that Goneril and Regan, because of their suffering at his irrational conduct, become almost objects of commiseration. They showed no disposition to mistreat their father, Brigham says, until his conduct became unbearable.[17]

The critical implications of Brigham's diagnosis are evident. If *King Lear* is nothing other than the account of a madman who by his irrational action disturbs the peace of society and causes suffering and finally death for himself, of what value is the play as tragedy? In essence, Brigham's criticism, like that of Charlotte Lennox, from which it stemmed, was a denial of *Lear* as great drama. And that was a characteristic of most of the "scientific" criticism of the nineteenth century.

Brigham's argument was taken up again three years later in the April, 1847, edition of *The American Journal of Insanity*. Dr. Isaac Ray, in that article, characterized Lear as an old man who, although not actually mad, was susceptible to insanity from the beginning of the play, and whose actual madness was brought on by the cruel treatment to which he was subjected.[18] Ray, thus, does not go quite so far as Brigham.

Dr. Ray was greatly impressed by the skill with which Shakspere presented his portrait of madness in its actual scientific aspects, and particularly with his distinction between the earlier and the later stages of Lear's aberration:

> The development of the early stage of Lear's insanity, or its "incubation," as it is technically called, is managed with masterly skill, the more surprising as it is the stage of the disease which attracts the least attention. And the reason is, that the derangement is evinced, not so much by delusions or gross improprieties of conduct, as by a mere exaggeration of natural peculiarities, by inconsistencies of behavior, by certain acts for which very plausible reasons are assigned, though they would never have been performed in a perfectly sound state of mind, by gusts of passion at every trifling provocation, or by doing very proper things at unreasonable times and occasions.[19]

Psychiatric science had not developed to any extent at the time that Brigham and Ray were writing, but that in the early stages of the science's development psychiatrists should seize upon Lear as a subject for analysis is among the greatest of tributes to Shakspere's genius.

Henry Norman Hudson in 1848 returned also to the supposition of Charlotte Lennox, but in his hands the idea assumed an entirely different shape. At the beginning of the play, wrote Hudson, Lear is already suffering from senile dementia. "With his body tottering beneath the weight of years and cares of state, his mind is sliding into second childhood which is content to play with the shadows of things which have been."[20]

One of the attributes of this senile dementia is an unnatural and almost morbid hungering after the outward tokens of affection, and therein (for Hudson) lay the basis of the tragedy.[21] Passion in senile dementia, he continued,

had the power to rejuvenate the body and to restore the energy of youth, and that also was illustrated by the play.[22]

Richard Grant White took issue with Brigham and Ray and with his contemporary and countryman, Hudson. He argued that although Lear's action in the first scene is irrational, it is an absurdity demanded by Shakspere's plot,[23] and that Lear shows no signs of insanity before his appearance on the heath. In this connection, White made one of the most significant of contributions to the analysis of the madness:

> He was not insane; he had not even begun to be insane before that time; and after that time we may almost say that he seeks madness. In the fury of his wrath as an offended king, and of his morbid grief as an outraged father, his intellect commits a sort of suicide.[24]

Lear goes mad partly because he is seeking madness. White further drew a fine distinction between those scenes in which Lear is losing his mind and those in which he has already lost it. "Men who are insane," he declared, "believe that they alone are reasonable; and when Lear at last is crazed he makes no allusion to the condition of his intellect."[25] In those scenes where Lear speaks of losing his reason, he still retains it.

The argument against those who maintained that Lear was mad from the play's beginning was carried farther by William Watkiss Lloyd who, in 1856, wrote that it was the sight of Mad Tom upon the heath which precipitated Lear's madness.[26] This was a notion based upon the popular medical concept of the times which held that the sight of one madman could produce madness in another.

The third professional psychiatrist of the nineteenth century to undertake the analysis of Lear's madness was John Charles Bucknill, whose series of articles and books on Shakspere's mad characters began to appear in 1859. Bucknill's argument, like those of Brigham and Ray, was that Lear is mad from the beginning of the play and

> that the partition of the kingdom, involving inevitable feuds and wars, is the first act of his developing insanity; and that the manner of its partition, the mock trial of his daughters' affections, and its tragical denouement, is the second. . .[27]

Bucknill took issue with both Coleridge and Hallam who had presented the traditional Romantic viewpoints. To Coleridge, who had declared that Lear was not mad at the beginning of the play and that we must accept his irrational action in the first scene as an improbability forced upon Shakspere by his plot, Bucknill replied that, although improbabilities are common in Shakspere, "there is one kind of improbability which is not to be found in Shakespeare — the systematic development of goodness from badness, of strength from weakness."[28]

Hallam's idea that great vigor and eloquence could be products of madness, he said, was contrary to all "the practical knowledge of mental pathology.[29] And he went on to explain that, "intellectual energy may indeed, sometimes be seen to grow stronger under the greatest trials of life, but never when the result of these trials is mental disease."[30]

The reason for earlier misinterpretations of Lear's madness, said Bucknill, was that critics had overlooked the early symptoms of the disorder and had "postponed its recognition until he is running about a frantic, raving madman."[31] Madness, he went on to say, has always been an attribute of despotic kings, as history shows, and thus, in the very fact of Lear's despotic power, we have an initial supposition of madness.[32] Lear's mind, moreover, has been affected by old age as well as despotism:

> In old age, the greedy man becomes the miser; in old age the immoral man becomes the shameless reprobate; in old age the unchecked passions of manhood tend to develop themselves into the exaggerated proportions of insanity.[33]

Bucknill added the fact of Lear's great physical strength as another symptom of his initial madness: "The state of hale bodily strength in senile mania is true to nature."[34] But as his greatest single evidence he cited Lear's action in dividing the kingdom. He made much of Coleridge's "silly trick" and declared that in the implications of that trick, which Coleridge had not seen, lay the evidence of Lear's early senile dementia.[35]

Among the indications of mental aberration prior to the heath scene, he pointed to Lear's treatment of Kent and

the language in which he berated him.[36] The entire episode, he maintained, showed "exaggerated passion, perverted affection, weakened judgement; all the elements, in fact, of madness except incoherence and delusion. These are added later."[37] Lear's conduct is that of a madman, and as such Bucknill justifies Goneril's objection to it. He further suggested Lear's treatment of her as another indication of his insanity.[38] "Enough of Lear's violence," he wrote, "both in language and conduct is manifested to confirm the truth of Goneril's harsh accusations." [39]

It was Goneril's action, Bucknill continued, which precipitated Lear from the earlier stage of his madness into the full madness of the scene upon the heath, which includes delusion and incoherence.[40] As a symptom of that incoherence, Bucknill cited:

> This flightiness of thought, this readiness to take up a subject strongly, and to lay it down lightly, to run from one subject to another, and still more, from one temper to another. . .[41]

The climax of Lear's disease, of course, manifests itself in the heath scene.[42] The transition from the earlier incomplete to the later complete stages of madness, said Bucknill, was made by Shakspere with scientific accuracy and with "a knowledge of principles, half of which would make the reputation of a modern psychologist."[43]

Bucknill followed the action of the play and illustrated the progress of Lear's madness from the first scene to its final consummation in death, justifying his observations by reference to what psychiatrists of the nineteenth century considered to be sound principles. For Hallam's explanation of the eloquence of Lear's madness, he substituted the idea that

> the eloquence of madness is partly the result of an imagination always vivid and now stimulated to excess, and of an involuntary display of oratorical power native to man, and partly of profound knowledge of human nature acquired during an age of practical kingship.[44]

Like his predecessors in the criticism of *King Lear*, Bucknill called attention to Shakspere's fine contrast of the

real madness of Lear with the assumed madness of Edgar.[45]

In 1866 appeared A. O. Kellogg's book, *Shakspeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility and Suicide,* a collection of essays which had been published separately between the years 1859 and 1864. Kellogg was also a professional psychiatrist, and the title page of his volume bears witness to his affiliation with the New York state mental hospital. His analysis of Lear closely followed the lines of his three predecessors and added little that was original.

His main point was that Lear possessed a predisposition to madness which was brought on by "exciting causes."[46] He followed the action of the play and showed how Lear was brought from the early predisposition to the stage of outright and complete madness. He pointed to Lear's monomaniacal fixation upon the ingratitude of his daughters as a symptom of complete madness, just as Joseph Warton had pointed to it a hundred years earlier.[47]

To the traditional illustration of Shakspere's differentiation between real and assumed madness, Kellogg added a new element which had not been emphasized before. Three types of madness, he said, were contrasted on the heath scene:

> the most ingeniously constructed scene in the whole play . . . in which the poet brings together Lear, now an undoubted madman, Edgar, who assumes madness for purposes of disguise and deception, and the fool.[48]

The fool was thus added to the spectacle of madness, and in 1875 the observation was repeated by Francis Jacox in his *Shakespeare Diversions.* Jacox wrote that, "In *Lear* each form of madness is exhausted — the congenital, the superinduced, the fictitious, as represented . . . in the Fool, in the King and in Edgar."[49]

The commentaries upon Lear's madness in the nineteenth century seem thus to have fallen roughly into two camps. On the one hand were the professional psychiatrists who carried on the tradition begun by Charlotte Lennox, and on the other were the purely literary men who seemed to follow that of Joseph Warton. One of the most significant

of this second group was Denton J. Snider whose Shaksperian studies began to appear in 1877. Snider took direct issue with the professional psychiatrists of his day:

> Yet we must not consider Lear insane at the start; an act of folly does not constitute insanity, else the world were one great madhouse.[50]

Lear's madness, he said, occurs during the scene on the heath and it is brought on by two factors: the storm and the appearance of Tom of Bedlam.[51] Snider was there echoing Lloyd who, more than twenty years earlier, had attributed Lear's breakdown partly to the appearance of the disguised Edgar. That a savage storm could produce madness was a belief that went back to the Elizabethan age itself. Snider further asserted that Lear's madness was of a purgative nature. It was a temporary delusion which had the power to transform his spirit.[52]

Snider's analysis was followed by that of Richard G. Moulton which did not differ from it greatly although it added to it some new viewpoints. Moulton said that Lear's madness was a gradual development caused by one shock after another, and that the full development of the madness occurred in the scene on the heath. The plot and Lear's madness have been developing simultaneously and both come to a climax together at that point.[53]

Moulton echoed both Snider and Lloyd in calling attention to Lear's meeting with Mad Tom as the event which finally precipitated him into full insanity.[54] He echoed A. O. Kellogg in his addition of the Fool to the traditionally cited madness contrast:

> When examined more closely this centrepiece exhibits not a duet but a trio of madness; with the other two there mingles a third form of what may be called madness, the professional madness of the court fool.[55]

From the fact that Moulton seems to claim originality for this observation, we may assume that he was not familiar with the work of Kellogg or Jacox. Moulton wrote much on Shakspere's use of madness as a dramatic device, and in the case of *King Lear* he said that it was used as "a variation and a relief to tragedy."[56]

In 1895, Barrett Wendell introduced an idea into *Lear* criticism which was not unrelated to that observation. Starting with the assumption that the modern audience cannot adequately understand *King Lear,* he concluded that it was the dramatic function of madness on the Elizabethan stage which governed much of Shakspere's creation, and that we were no longer familiar with that function. Madness upon the Elizabethan stage, he declared, was a source of comedy. Lear and Edgar in their madness, both real and feigned, were designed as comic characters who would cater to the peculiar taste of the Elizabethan audience.[57] As evidence of this taste, Wendell cited the use of Madness in *The Duchess of Malfi* and *The Changeling.* "Only when we understand," he asserted, "that King Lear, for all his marvellous pathos, was meant, in scene after scene, to impress an audience as comic, can we begin to understand the theatrical intention of Shakespeare's tragedy."[58]

Perhaps the last great work of Shaksperian criticism which the nineteenth century produced was Frederick S. Boas's *Shakspere and his Predecessors,* which first appeared in 1896. In many respects, Boas's book represents a culmination and epitome of the principal ideas developed by the earlier critics of his century, and it is therefore fitting that we should bring our summary to a close with his comments.

Boas agreed with those who maintained that Lear was not mad until the scene upon the heath, and he echoed those earlier critics like Lloyd and Snider who had said that it was the appearance of Mad Tom which produced the final and complete madness:

> His wits begin to turn, and soon he is driven completely mad by an incident which links together the major and minor plots. Kent leads him for shelter to a hovel, whence rushes out Edgar in the disguise of a Tom of Bedlam . . . The contact with this apparent lunatic, through the operation of a familiar law, produces total insanity in Lear, and the limits of tragic horror are reached in the wild trio of madness that follows—the ravings of Lear, the feigned frenzy of Edgar, and the babbling of the Fool.[59]

We may accept that as the dominant note upon which nineteenth-century analysis of the problem ended. We may look at it and realize that it is a synthesis of many conflicting

ideas, for intelligent criticism of a work of art which has been a part of the intimate life of a people for almost three hundred years must include the sifting through, amplification and modification of earlier ideas. And that is what, essentially, the criticism of our own age has been. We may look at the work of E. E. Stoll, G. Wilson Knight, Granville-Barker, M. R. Ridley—of every significant critic that has written of Lear's madness in our day—and we may see in what respects they go back to Coleridge, Snider, Moulton and Wendell, and how ultimately they all go back to the eighteenth-century writings of Joseph Warton and Charlotte Lennox.

University of N. C.

---

[1]H. S. Robinson, *English Shakespearean Criticism in the Eighteenth Century* (New York, 1932), p. 91.

[2]Essays 93 and 97, the first two of the series, dealt with *The Tempest*.

[3]Joseph Warton, *The Adventurer* (New Ed., London, 1797), IV, 60.

[4]*Ibid.*, p. 140.

[5]Henry Mackenzie, *The Mirror* (London, 1794), p. 223.

[6]Horace Walpole, *The Castle of Otranto and The Mysterious Mother*, ed. Montague Summers (London, 1924), pp. 257-258.

[7]Mrs. Lennox was probably the first American Shaksperian critic. Her book was written in New York and published in London with a preface by Samuel Johnson.

[8]Charlotte Lennox, *Shakespeare Illustrated etc.* (London, 1754), III, 287.

[9]Mackenzie, *Loc. cit.*

[10]Charles Dibdin, *A Complete History of the English Stage* (London, 1800), III, 323.

[11]Samuel Taylor Coleridge, *Notes and Lectures upon Shakespeare* (London, 1849), I, 189.

[12]*Ibid.*

[13]Charles Lamb, *Critical Essays*, ed. William Macdonald (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1903), p. 32.

[14]William Hazlitt, *The Characters of Shakespeare's Plays* (London, 1878), p. 112.

[15]Henry Hallam, *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1841), II, 200.

[16]H. H. Furness (ed.) *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare* (4th ed., Philadelphia, 1899), IV, 412.

[17]*Ibid.*, p. 413.

[18]*Ibid.*, pp. 413-414.

[19]*Ibid.*, p. 414.

[20]Henry Norman Hudson, *Lectures on Shakespeare* (New York, 1848), II, 240.

[21]*Ibid.*, p. 243.

[22]*Ibid.*, pp. 249-250.

[23]Richard Grant White, *Studies in Shakespeare* (Boston, 1899), p. 218.

[24]*Ibid.*, p. 224.

[25]*Ibid.*, p. 225.

[26]William Watkiss Lloyd *Critical Essays on the Plays of Shakespeare* (London, 1894), p. 448.

[27]John Charles Bucknill, *The Mad Folk of Shakespeare* (2nd ed., London, 1867), pp. 174-175.

[28]*Ibid.*, p. 163.

[29]*Ibid.*, p. 165.

[30]*Ibid.*
[31]*Ibid.*, p. 169.
[32]*Ibid.*, p. 171.
[33]*Ibid.*, pp. 172-173.
[34]*Ibid.*, p. 174.
[35]*Ibid.*, pp. 174-175.
[36]*Ibid.*, p. 176.
[37]*Ibid.*, p. 177.
[38]*Ibid.*, p. 178.
[39]*Ibid.*, pp. 172-173.
[40]*Ibid.*, p. 182.
[41]*Ibid.*, pp. 188-189.
[42]*Ibid.*, p. 193.
[43]*Ibid.*, pp. 196-197.
[44]*Ibid.*, p. 218.
[45]*Ibid.*, p. 208.
[46]A. O. Kellogg, *Shakspeare's Delineations of Insanity, Imbecility and Suicide* (New York, 1866), p. 14.
[47]*Ibid.*, p. 23.
[48]*Ibid.*, p. 24.
[49]Francis Jacox, *Shakespeare Diversions* (New York, 1875), p. 215.
[50]Denton J. Snider, *The Shakespearean Drama* (St. Louis, 1887), p. 156.
[51]*Ibid.*, p. 175.
[52]*Ibid.*, p. 178.
[53]Richard G. Moulton, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Artist* (Oxford, 1893), pp. 209-210.
[54]*Ibid.*, p. 217.
[55]*Ibid.*, p. 218.
[56]Richard G. Moulton, *Shakespeare as a Dramatic Thinker* (New York, 1924), p. 190.
[57]Barrett Wendell, *William Shakspere* (New York, 1893), pp. 294-195.
[58]*Ibid.*, p. 295.
[59]Frederick S. Boas, *Shakspere and his Predecessors* (New York, 1906), p. 449.

CONTRAST OF TEMPO IN THE BALCONY SCENE

By JOHN W. DRAPER

NOT only the meaning but the textual detail of Shakspere's dialogue reflects the tempo at which he expected a given passage to be delivered: vowel and consonant combinations lead the voice to *lento* or *andante* or *allegro* or *presto*; ellipses and over-long lines suggest haste; the use of the emphatic *do* suggests deliberate speech; and, most important of all, the presence or the absence—evident in the meter—of slurrings between words as in *don't* or *for't* and within certain words, such as *ever* and *heaven* show the tempo of the verse.[1] Such evidence may show the speech-characteristics of a rôle, slow or fast, smooth or jerky; and this in turn seems to show how Shakspere at times adjusted his lines to the speech-peculiarities of the actor for whom he wrote the part:[2] in this way, one may even guess some characteristics of Shakspere's own speech, from the parts he played.[3] In an important rôle, moreover, changes in tempo should synchronize with the situation, the emotion and even a fundamental evolution in a given character; and such would seem to be the case in the tempo of Desdemona.[2] The present study, however, is concerned with the more superficial relation of tempo to literary and dramatic style.

Contrast is one of the most striking of devices; and, indeed, without it, poetry and prose would both sink to drab monotony. In *Romeo and Juliet,* a play of wit and lyricism, style is the dominant dramatic element; the two protagonists might well show some contrast in their style of speech; and this contrast might well appear in the tempo of their respective rôles. In Acts I and II, both characters speak somewhat slower than the rapid norm of the Elizabethan stage, in which the evidence for rapidity preponderates by about three to one. In Act I, the rôle of Romeo, strangely enough, shows slightly more evidence for slow than for fast speech; and, in Act II (omitting the Balcony Scene), it is slightly shaded in the opposite direction. Juliet in Act I—though the evidence of her part is hardly enough to furnish proof—seems to be even slower than Romeo; and, in Act II

(again omitting the Balcony Scene), she is, like Romeo, slightly more rapid. In short, the tempo of the two lovers in most of the first two acts displays no striking contrast, and is notable only for being rather slower than the average speech of the Shaksperian stage.

The Balcony Scene is an utter contrast in tempo to the scenes before and around it, and shows a striking contrast of speed between the two lovers: Romeo's lines supply almost four evidences for slow speech to one for fast, a complete reversal of the norm; and Juliet's, on the other hand, are nearer the usual ratio, and are more fast than slow by about two to three. In Shakspere's text, Romeo has about eighty lines, and Juliet almost one hundred and ten, that is an approximate ratio of three to four; but Romeo may actually have had more speaking-time. Elizabethan actors, as Hamlet suggests, spoke "trippingly"; but, in this play, which according to its prologue took only two hours on the stage, the two chief characters in their most famous scene pronounce their lines much slower than the norm, and in the case of Romeo with an extreme deliberation that reminds one of the dazed and halting speech of Desdemona in the last act of *Othello*. When the lovers meet again in Act III, the speech of both of them is somewhat slower than the norm; but, as in Act I, the contrast is but slight: in Romeo, the evidence somewhat favors rapidity; in Juliet, the opposite—just contrary to the very striking contrast on the Balcony Scene. Apparently, therefore, the extreme contrast of tempo in the Balcony Scene arose neither from the characters of Romeo or of Juliet, nor from the situation, nor from the speech habits of the original actors: for all these theories require that it would appear elsewhere in the play; and it does not. In Act III, as a whole, the evidence for Romeo somewhat favors the fast; in the third scene, Juliet is fast by a count of more than two to one; and, in the fifth scene, she is slow by a count of about three to four. In Act IV, Romeo doesn't appear; and Juliet's lines are slow by two to three. In Act V, Juliet's few lines show an even balance of evidence; and Romeo's show almost twice as much evidence for rapid tempo. In short, Romeo's part outside the Balcony Scene does not stray far from a ratio of one to one. This is slow for the Shaksperian stage; but, in the Balcony Scene, it is retarded even more to the asto-

nishing ratio of four slow to one fast, a ratio that appears nowhere else in his part. Juliet's rôle for the entire play averages about the same as Romeo's, but with greater variation in single scenes; and her proportion in the Balcony Scene of two slow to three fast re-appears in Act IV, and is nearer the Elizabethan norm than Romeo's. Shakspere seems to have intended the Balcony Scene to move slowly with an *andante* lyricism; and he further accentuated it with great contrast in the speeds of the two speakers. The lover, for all his fiery protestations, speaks almost *largo* and generally *legato,* as a contrast to his lady's greater variety and speed.

Some actors say that Romeo's part is one of the most ungrateful major rôles in Shakspere, because he is a mere foil to Juliet; and his more monotonous, heavier tempo would seem to agree with this: he acts as a sort of bass accompaniment while Juliet carries the air: at all events, the length and importance of his speeches dwindle as the scene progresses, and he has few of the purple passages. In short, Shakspere, in dramatically building up the scene, seems to have been sacrificing Romeo for a brilliant lyric climax in the part of Juliet, and the contrast in their tempos also doubtless contributed to this effect. No other reason for it is apparent; and one finds it in no other scene. It does not seem to inhere either in the characters of the speakers or in the momentary situation: if lovers should prolong their accents, why does not Juliet do so? Indeed, this contrast seems to be purely a trick of style, without deep dramatic meaning, devised purely for theatrical effect, like the artificial lighting of a Rembrandt. Shakspere's failure in *Romeo and Juliet* to integrate tempo with plot or character (as he later did in the part of Desdemona) is not surprising; for he had not yet mastered the complexities of tragic structure, as the very plot of this play attests with its numerous examples of coincidence. In short, Shakspere uses contrast in tempo to heighten the effect of a lyric scene, even though there is no clear reason for such a contrast: the device, though somewhat specious, was doubtless most effective.

One might ask further how far modern actors instinctively adjust their rendition of the lines to the tempos that Shakspere apparently expected, how far their "feel" of in-

terpretation leads them to conform to the expression-marks inherent in his texts. Of course, the modern stage with its proscenium arch will not allow—especially not in a large, echoing theatre—the speed of the Elizabethan actor's speech; but, in the Balcony Scene, the contrast is so great that modern Shaksperian actors, though scaling down the average tempo, might retain the difference between the slow-speaking Romeo and the faster Juliet. Sothern and Marlowe were for many years a standard of Shaksperian production; and a comparison of the tempos indicated in the original text with a Victor recording of the Balcony Scene as they presented it, should indicate how nearly at least two modern actors reflect the contrast that the dramatist seems to have intended.

As recorded for the victrola, this scene is rather heavily cut, especially the earlier speeches of Romeo. In fact, the 190 lines of the original are reduced to about 120; and. of these lines, Romeo has about thirty-four; the Nurse, a few interjections; and Juliet the lion's share. Thus the preponderance of Juliet over her lover is greatly augmented. The evidences of speed apparent in this abbreviated version even accentuate the contrast apparent in the uncut text. Romeo's part supplies three evidences for fast as against eighteen for slow tempo, a proportion of six to one in favor of retardation; and Juliet's ratio shows forty evidences of speed to fifteen for slow tempo, a ratio of one to almost three in favor of speed. In short, these calculations show an even more deliberate Romeo than in the uncut text, contrasting with an impetuous Juliet, whose faster lines show therefore a greater variation than her lover's slow and more even pace.

How do Sothern and Marlowe deliver these 120 lines? Some speeches are too short to give clear evidences of tempo; and the tempo sometimes changes within a line; but a rough estimate, gleaned from repeated playing of the record, may well serve: as Mr. Sothern interprets Romeo's rôle, twenty-nine lines are clearly slower than the average, and five lines faster, exactly the same ratio of six to one that the cut text affords; and, as Miss Marlowe interprets Juliet, forty-four lines are fast, and thirty-five lines are slow—a ratio of about four to three plus, somewhat slower

than the evidence that Shakspere's text suggests, a change perhaps dictated by the size and construction of modern theatres. In short, the actors have maintained the contrast that Shakspere seems to have intended, although they doubtless keyed the whole passage down to a slower tempo to make it audible beyond the proscenium arch. The following diagram is set forth in approximate ratios:

	Romeo		Juliet	
	Fast	Slow	Fast	Slow
Evidences for tempo in Shakspere's uncut text (190 lines) . .	1	4	3	2
Evidences for tempo in text cut for Sothern and Marlowe (120 lines)	1	6	3—	1
Tempo of lines as given by actors	1	6	4	3+

The instinct of the actors, therefore, would seem to have guided them aright in their timing of this scene; but, unfortunately, the matter is not quite as simple as mere ratios would imply; for Sothern and Marlowe do not always pronounce passages as Shakspere's indications seem to require. Mr. Sothern's part, being almost entirely slow both in Shakspere's text and in his own rendition, only rarely errs; but even he gives *andante* time to the line, "The exchange of thy love's faithful vow for mine," in which the meter clearly requires the slurring of the first two words into one, and this implies rapid delivery. Miss Marlowe's part, having much more variation, has many more opportunities for mistakes in tempo. For example, she pronounces very slowly:

> O Romeo, Romeo! wherefore art thou Romeo?
> Deny thy father and refuse thy name;
> Or, if thou wilt not, be but sworn my love,
> And I'll no longer be a Capulet.

Yet "Romeo" is slurred into two syllables three times in the first line (Cf. line 51 where the meter shows it slowed to three syllables); and the contraction "I'll" in the last line also implies speed. Miss Marlowe doubtless felt—and properly—that the speech required emphasis; but retarded tempo was apparently not the type of emphasis that Shakepere intended: perhaps change in voice-inflection or in

volume would be more effective. Later, Miss Marlowe renders rapidly, "And I | will take thee at thy word," and also "I | am too quickly won," though the lack of slurring in both cases suggests a slower delivery. Miss Marlowe on the whole rightly realizes the *rubato* delivery appropriate to her rôle in this scene; but, again and again, she renders slow passages fast and *vice versa.* Shakspere's contrast between the two speakers is apparent; but the interpretation of the tempo is often in opposition to the expression-marks that his text supplies.

These studies of Shakspere's tempo seem to have various scholarly uses in throwing light on the dramatist's characterization and his style, and on the Elizabethan presentation of the plays; but perhaps their most significant value might be as a guide to actors' interpretation of the lines; for timing is all-important on the stage. The human voice allows three chief means of emphasis: change in volume, change in tempo, including pauses, and change in intonation. If an actor feels sure that a passage requires emphasis, such a study as this can often show him whether Shakspere intended emphasis by change in tempo or by some other means; and it can certainly indicate the sort of speed required for his part as a whole and often for individual speeches. Perhaps acting editions should be prepared in which tempo is marked on the margins; and then, if the actor insists on flying in the face of the evidence, he at least knows that he is doing so. Musicians rarely take great liberties with the expression-marks of Beethoven; and one might ask how far an oral interpreter has the right to vary those of Shakspere.

West Virginia University

---

[1]See the present writer, "Speech-Tempo in Act I of *Othello*," *West Va. Phil. Bull.*, 1946.

[2]See the present writer, "The Tempo of Shylock's Speech," *JEGP.*, XLIV, 281 *et sep.*

[3]See the present writer, "The Tempo of Shakespeare's Speech."

[4]See the present writer, "Changes in the Tempo of Desdemona's Speech," *Anglica.*

DRAMATIST AT THE CROSSROADS*

(A Suggestion concerning *Measure for Measure*)

By E. J. West

IN 1874, *Meassure for Measure* brought before Walter Pater "a group of persons, attractive, full of desire, vessels of the genial, seed-bearing powers of nature, a gaudy existence flowering out over the old court and city of Vienna, a spectacle of the fulness and pride of life which to some may seem to touch the verge of wantonness."[1] A half-century later, the same play seemed to Dover Wilson to be "written in much the same key as *Point Counter Point* and other of Mr. Aldous Huxley's novels," and he found in the play "The hatred of sentimentalism and romance, the savage determination to tear aside all veils, to expose reality in its crudity and hideousness, the self-laceration, weariness, discord, cynicism and disgust" which characterized the "literature of negation" of the early thirties.[2]

I am not here embarked upon a footnote to W. H. Durham's essay, "*Measure for Measure* a Measure for Critics,"[3] although I am sufficiently sensible of the truism he there belabors, that critics, even the most minor, necessarily interpret all art in terms of their sentiments, their prejudices, and surely, one should add, their immediate circumstances—of health, of life, of happiness. But it does seem to me that both the late nineteenth-century romantic-sentimental point of view, of which Pater was by no means the least brilliant and effective exponent, and the modern pseudo-objective, psychologico-scientific point of view, of which Wilson is a typical romantic-sentimental exponent, tend to neglect equally not only the age in which the play was written, which Schücking and Stoll have urged as the proper vantage point, but also the man who wrote it, who should most certainly be considered somewhere in the process of analysis and appreciation.

*This paper was finished before the writer saw Roy W. Battenhouse's article, "*Measure For Measure* and Christian Doctrine of the Atonement," *PMLA LXI* (Dec. 1946), 1029-1059. I have not been able to study the article as yet in detail, but I find myself incapable of accepting the thesis that Shakspere was as familiar with or as interested in Christian doctrine *per se* as Mr. Battenhouse seems to suggest.

I realize also how superfluous must seem any general impressionistic note on this play beside the wise and witty eloquence with which in the annual Shakspere lecture of the British Academy in 1937, R. W. Chambers, by considering both the man and his age, "tried to fight a good fight"[4] on behalf at once of the Christian and the comedic virtues of *Measure for Measure* against all those critics who had attacked the play, its arbitrary plot, or its disturbing characters; I remember how beautifully he battled (like his beloved Beowulf against the monsters of a magic long ago) with Wilson and "all those spells which the Wizard professor of the North, the Prince of the Power of the Air, can weave from his chair amid the mists of high Dunedin." I recall his plea that we study Shakspere's plays "as the works of art which we know them to be; rather than weave baseless conjectures concerning details of a biography which we can never know." But I feel strongly that Professor Chambers, even on the printed page, is far more persuasive than the play or its perplexing characters, and that he himself sinned, if pardonably and pleasantly, against his own dictum that "No one formula can summarize Shakespeare's life for us,"[5] and that he found in the play the measure of a Shakspere he had himself preconceived according to a private and personal, if most impressive and enviable, formula.

I am not suggesting that it is easy or even possible to achieve a completely objective point of view, rather that it is desirable to admit the necessarily magnetic spell of the subjective reaction and so at least aim at the objective analysis. An active theatre practitioner like myself seeks living tissue and not fossilized remains in any dramatic script he approaches, and he tries, with all due caution and self-suspicion, in studying a Shaksperian script, to think how the playwright might have felt about writing the play at a particular time, for a particular company, for a particular audience, himself ever mindful of himself and therefore desirous of as little self-compromise as possible in satisfying both the company and the audience.

As my title suggests, my premise, unlike that of Chambers or the earlier critics he tilted with (and, I think, conquered), or that of later scholars astride specially designed

hobby-horses, like the one called "comical satire" so well ridden by Oscar James Campbell,[6] is that the dramatist was in a dilemma at the time he wrote the play—not in a mood, not on the heights of Chambers' Christian charity, not in the depths of pagan despair preferred by other critics—just in a dilemma, stranded at a crossroads, not knowing quite his destination or the thoroughfare which led thereto. Fully aware of what a trouncing I should receive from Professor Chambers in the unlikely event that he should ever view these remarks, I still proclaim my belief that Shakspere's "high comedies" show him in part at least attempting to overlook, rather than to look at, his age, that is, to look beyond the immediate present toward a pleasant land of Arden or of Illyria. I also believe that, having fully developed his wilful and wistful idealism in *Twelfth Night,* and probably having perceived finally the futility of escapism, he decided at last in his "dark comedies" (and may one suggest that they *do* leave a dark brown taste upon most sensitive palates?) that he must consider his age.

And by "consider his age" I do not mean "consider its tastes" (for surely his own audience accepted easily what has so disturbed the audiences and critics of subsequent periods: the moral perplexity and self-contradictoriness characteristic of the play) but I mean "look at the age," record its surface ebb and flow, not moralize upon the undertow or groundswell underneath. In *Troilus and Cressida,* it is generally agreed, Shakspere was commenting obliquely on contemporary manners and problems. Even more, I submit, in *Measure for Measure* he was writing for an age and of an age not too unlike the Vienna, corrupt and debased, in which the only devotees of virtue were self-righteous Puritans like Isabella (I am remembering vividly Professor Chambers' defence of Isabella, but regretfully I note in the rhythm of his prose-commentary a warmth and sincerity lacking in the verse of her speeches), over-zealous and hypocritical Puritans like Angelo, or philosophizing and moralizing onlookers like the Duke. For the rest, the people he observed about him were on the whole amoral like Pompey, with his "Truly, sir, I am a poor fellow who would live!" or like Lucio, with his sprightly charm and gay licentiousness, a bit of a gadfly but an ingratiating and attractive one.

In the main Shakspere was content to accept the story as he found it in Whetstone's *Promos and Cassandra,* except that he casually disposed "happy endings" in accord with the formulae of his time, certainly not in accord with Pater's noble spirit of "poetical justice,"[7] nor, I regret to say, with any special reference to what Chambers found constant in Shakspere, "a belief in forgiveness as the virtue by which human goodness draws nearest to the divine."[8] To round off his strong prejudice toward coupling leading characters, possibly to give a part to a special boy in the company, and even conceivably to find an excuse for working in one of his loveliest fragments of song (an excellent and most justifiable reason), the dramatist introduced Mariana, a pawn, but one who strangely speaks with a genuine sincerity largely lacking in the words and rhythms of the more important characters. The cool, impersonal, emotional tone which pervades the play, even in the bravura passages of Vincentio, Isabella, and Claudio, is, I feel, a clue to Shakspere's attempt to evaluate his age simply by recording it, the while he strove to hold in check his personal feelings concerning "the expense of spirit in a waste of shame."

I have said that we might profitably consider the probable ensemble of the company for which the play was written. If we do so, we discover sufficient reason for the introduction of the potentially interesting Froth, who disappears with the rapidity of his name; of that most ill-yclept Mistress Overdone, who is, in fact, so little done that it is difficult even to remember her two entrances; of Elbow, that embryonic Dogberry who never quite comes up to the promise of his first appearance; of the two Friars, Thomas and Peter, whose dramatic functions could so easily have been performed by either singly; of Abhorson, that super-supernumerary; and of Barnardine, who could so well have been merely referred to by the major characters. Of boys currently in the company, one can entertain no very high opinion: except for the mildly sympathetic child who played Mariana, the only capable player of women's parts, the boy cast for Isabella, would seem not only to have lacked the charm of those unfortunately since grown-up actors for whom in their soprano days were conceived Rosalind and Celia, Viola and Olivia, but to have actively partaken of

that moral smugness whose possession by the Lady Alice Egerton is the best excuse one can think up for Milton's later reproducing in *Comus* a sister-portrait to Shakspere's most unintriguing picture of feminine chastity and self-conscious prudery.

But what of our dramatist himself? What was his solution of his dilemma? What was his decision when he found himself at the crossroads, with the road by which he had arrived blocked off by too many unrepeatable successes, and no new road clear for future passage? It is my belief that he loitered for a time at the crossroads, but that he was not happy merely measuring out his story to the measure of his actors for a certain measure of money in return; that he was not satisfied with commenting dispassionately upon his age, his world, and the world. I believe that he made peace with himself for the time being by writing those idealistic and "noble" passages which so entranced the minds of the Victorians, which still make the play so "quotable," which struck such fiery eloquent response from Professor Chambers, and that he distributed these finer speeches in situations and to characters throughout the play where they would seem least inappropriate. I say least *in*-appropriate, for the sensitive reader, ever mindful of the admirable dramatic fitness of the "purple passages" in the earlier and later comedies, in the histories (exclusive of *Richard II,* that long dramatic monologue so oddly broken up to be spoken by a large company of actors), and in the tragedies, must be shocked when Claudio, that mere cut-out character, suddenly breaks into the moving, haunting rhetoric of:

> Ay, but to die, and go we know not where;
> To lie in cold obstruction and to rot;
> This sensible warm motion to become
> A kneaded clod; and the delighted spirit
> To bathe in fiery floods, or to reside
> In thrilling region of thick-ribbëd ice;
> To be imprison'd in the viewless winds,
> And blown with restless violence round about
> The pendant world; or to be worse than worst
> Of those that lawless and incertain thoughts
> Imagine howling: 'tis too horrible!
> The weariest and most loathëd wordly life
> That age, ache, penury and imprisonment

Can lay on nature is a paradise
To what we fear of death.

Claudio never thought up that. Shakspere did. And having thought it up — and out — perforce he used it (artists are improvident only with material things, not with the things of art). And since no character in the play could measure up to the speech, he measured it almost abstractly — or even abstractedly?—to a suitable situation in his borrowed story.

Thus, standing puzzled at the crossroads, not yet having discovered that strait and narrow path which led to the damned heaven of Hamlet and of Lear, Shakspere heeded the call of his job, possibly of an empty purse, and sent down to the theatre for his fellows to act a play almost absentminded in part, one that baffles the actors out of attempting to play it and that befuddles and bemuddles the critical mind, just because it was written by a man who had by now so well earned his trade that he could even absent-mindedly do a good technical job of plotting and planning. But for all its occasional technical dexterity, even its spasmodic mastery of dramatic matters, it is a play of shreds and patches, shreds of Shakspere's reporting of his world, patches of his commentary upon his universe, neither too neatly sewed upon the generally competent tailor's job of the plot proper.

University of Colorado

* This paper was finished before the writer saw Roy W. Battenhouse's article, "Measure for Measure" and Christian Doctrine of the Aatonement," PMLA LXI (Dec. 1946), 1029-1059. I have not been able to study the article as yet indetail ,but I find myself incapable of accepting the thesis that Shakspere was as familiar with or as interested in Christian doctrine per se as Mr. Battenhouse seems to suggest.

---

[1]Walter Pater, *Appreciations* (London, 1918), pp. 173-174.
[2]J. Dover Wilson, *The Essential Shakespeare* (Cambridge, 1943), p. 117.
[3]In *Essays in Criticism by Members of the Department of English, University of California* (Berkeley, 1929).
[4]R. W. Chambers, *The Jacobean Shakespeare and Measure for Measure.* From the Proceedings of the British Academy, Volume XXIII (London, 1937), p. 60.
[5]*Ibid.*, p. 59.
[6]Oscar James Campbell, *Shakespeare's Satire* (Oxford University Press, 1943).
[7]Pater, *op. cit.*, p. 183.
[8]Chambers, *op. cit.*, p. 60.

AND THEN STRATFORD

Year after year the century-new voice
Had roll'd its drama on expectant heart,
Had woven that most wondrous web — the art
Creating character with whim, will, choice,
Majestic suffering and winsome joys.
Upon the stage, beside the hearth, would start
Such poetry as only men impart
Who have the minds of seers, the lips of boys.

I knew them all: Othello, Hamlet, Lear,
Macbeth, Cordelia, Rosalind, and Puck,
That sweeping cavalcade — fool, buccaneer,
Ghost, lord, elf, wench, and king, by line or luck . . .
And then across his threshold, then, at last,
I walk'd where his immortal feet had passed!

EDNA D. ROMIG

Boulder, Colorado